Download for Free: Robert F. Kennedy's New Book — 'A Letter to Liberals'

05/08/23 • COVID • NEWS

One Health: A Plan to 'Surveil and Control Every Aspect of Life on Earth'?

Experts who spoke with The Defender suggested One Health has more to do with a biosecurity agenda, a global surveillance system, vaccine passports and restrictions on human behavior than it has to do with protecting human health.

By **Michael Nevradakis, Ph.D.**

29

Miss a day, miss a lot.** Subscribe to The Defender's Top News of the Day. **It's free.

***Editor's note**: This is part two of a two-part series on the One Health initiative. Read part one here.*

The World Health Organization (WHO) defines "One Health," as "an integrated, unifying approach that aims to sustainably balance and optimize the health of people, animals and ecosystems," as they are "closely linked and interdependent" — a concept that on the surface appears to promote noble goals interlinking human and environmental health.

However, some scientists and medical experts are concerned about One Health's vague goals. Arguing that the concept has been "hijacked," they question the intent of those involved with the development and global rollout of the concept — including the WHO, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and the World Bank.

Experts who spoke with The Defender also raised questions about other aspects of the One Health concept, including a biosecurity agenda, a global surveillance system, vaccine passports and restrictions on human behavior.

While these goals are underpinned by a vaguely defined "Theory of Change," experts told The Defender that major financial interests are at the heart of the One Health agenda, which appears to be closely linked to climate change and sustainable development initiatives promoted by the same global organizations.

One Health objectives include a 'global takeover of everything'

In a May 1 article, Dr. Joseph Mercola connected the One Health concept, as promoted by global organizations, to the policies and restrictions pursued in response to COVID-19, describing it as an attempted "global takeover of everything."

Mercola tied the One Health concept to key entities that have supported gain-of-function research. According to Mercola:

> "Interestingly, the term 'One Health,' which was formally adopted by the WHO and the G20 health ministers in 2017, was first coined by the executive vice president of the EcoHealth Alliance, the same firm that appears to have had a hand in the creation of SARS-CoV-2."

During the 2019 lecture "Can One Health Help Prevent the Next Pandemic?" EcoHealth Alliance President Peter Daszak, Ph.D., commissioner in The Lancet's One Health Commission, said "emerging infectious diseases" are "a growing global threat."

He also argued that many of these emerging diseases are "zoonotic — spread from animals to humans."

Francis Boyle, J.D., Ph.D., professor of international law at the University of Illinois and a bioweapons expert who drafted the Biological Weapons Anti-Terrorism Act of 1989, questioned this narrative, telling The Defender:

> "All these 'emerging infectious diseases' are emerging out of their offensive biological warfare weapons programs conducted in their BSL4 [biosecurity level 4] and BSL3 laboratories.
>
> "If you look at the people on the WHO advisory committee dealing with 'emerging infectious diseases,' that's exactly what they are doing — 'emerging' them from their labs."

One example is that of Marion Koopmans, DVM, Ph.D., director of the WHO Collaborating Centre for emerging infectious diseases at Erasmus Medical Centre in the Netherlands and member of the WHO's One Health High-Level Expert Panel (OHHLEP).

According to Boyle, "Erasmus is where this offensive Nazi biowarfare gain-of-function death science dirty work first became notorious under Fouchier, [who] started the entire controversy over his gain-of-function work there."

Boyle was referring to Ron Fouchier, Ph.D., who also is deputy head of Erasmus' Viroscience Department and who, according to Science, "alarmed the world" in 2011, after he and other researchers "separately modified the deadly avian H5N1 influenza virus so that it spread between ferrets" — an early example of gain-of-function research.

Dr. Meryl Nass, an internist and biological warfare epidemiologist who is a member of the Children's Health Defense scientific advisory committee, said such objectives are kept deliberately vague. She referred to a CDC document that stated:

> "Successful public health interventions require the cooperation of human, animal, and environmental health partners … Other relevant players in a One Health approach could include law enforcement, policymakers, agriculture, communities, and even pet owners.
>
> "By promoting collaboration across all sectors, a One Health approach can achieve the best health outcomes for people, animals, and plants in a shared environment."

Nass wrote on her blog, "I anticipate that One Health will be used to impose changes in the way humans and animals interact … most likely based on the needs of the WEF [World Economic Forum]/elites and not the needs of the people or the animals that will be affected."

Reggie Littlejohn, founder and president of Women's Rights Without Frontiers and co-chair of the Stop Vaccine Passports Task Force, told The Defender, "It's not clear that One Health is prioritizing human health."

Highlighting the "vague" language employed by the global organizations promoting One Health, Littlejohn said that one goal may be to "govern farm animal health in addition to human health," through which "they could do things like forcing vaccines on livestock."

One Health means 'surveilling everything'

The experts who spoke with The Defender expressed concerns over the biosecurity agenda that is associated with the stated objectives of One Health.

According to Nass, this reflects how the WHO "has been changing into a biosecurity agency," adding that "the justification, apparently, for the WHO's director-general to take over jurisdiction of healthcare during pandemics, but also potentially ecosystems, animals and plants, is through One Health."

Nass noted that One Health "is mentioned several times in the National Defense [Authorization] Act for Fiscal Year 2023" (NDAA), which includes 18 pages on "pandemic preparedness" and a formal definition of the "One Health approach" on page 952 of the act.

Independent journalist and researcher James Roguski also highlighted the prominent placement of One Health in the NDAA and noted that, by formally defining the concept within the act, it is now part of the Code of Federal Regulations.

However, Roguski said the NDAA goes even further:

> "The U.S. has pledged a billion dollars a year to the World Bank Pandemic Fund in support of the global health security agenda. The WHO is one of 14 intermediaries who will receive and redistribute some of that billion dollars.
>
> "Basically, it's capitalism, it's corruption, it's an abomination from a health perspective. Let's just throw money at pharmaceutical companies, build out the infrastructure in these nations and, if you're making tons of products locally, you're going to be able to convince the local government to stick them in people's arms or shove it down their throat.
>
> "And none of it really has shown to be of any health benefit. It's damage to people's health."

Associated with the promotion of a global biosecurity agenda is the development of a global surveillance infrastructure that would purportedly protect human and animal health and the environment. An Oct. 3, 2022, WHO document states:

> "The emergence of the SARS-CoV-2 virus that caused COVID-19 has underlined the need to strengthen the One Health approach, with a greater emphasis on connections to animal health and the environment …
>
> "… It uses the close, interdependent links among these fields to create new surveillance and disease control methods. …
>
> "We now have an unprecedented opportunity to strengthen collaboration and policies across these many areas and reduce the risk of future pandemics and epidemics while also addressing the ongoing burden of endemic and non-communicable diseases
>
> "Surveillance that monitors risks and helps identify patterns across these many areas is needed."

Remarking on this, Littlejohn said One Health's proponents talk about "interoperable, integrated surveillance systems." She told The Defender:

> "I believe … these surveillance systems of people, animals, plants, and the environment are going to be coordinated by some kind of a global surveillance system that is interoperable globally and integrated.
>
> "Whoever's running this show, the WHO, the Chinese Communist Party … the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, who are the people who really appear to be running the show at the WHO, are going to be able to tap into and see all of our private information. Not just us, but animals and plants."

Dr. David Bell, a public health physician and biotech consultant and former director of global health technologies at Intellectual Ventures Global Good Fund, told The Defender that what global organizations intend is "surveilling everything." He said:

> "It means surveilling everything, surveilling the climate for possible threats, surveilling animal population, surveilling wildlife, surveilling the soil to see if there's new traces of virus or bacteria in river systems, et cetera.
>
> "This allows you to 'discover' what we already know is nature, and then turn nature into a potential threat or into a threat. The more surveillance you have and the wider it is, the more inevitable 'threats' you'll find … because you can make an argument that almost any new variant virus is a 'threat.'
>
> "It will allow them to keep a constant flow of fear which then allows you to introduce authoritarian controls such as central bank digital currencies and digital passports … that allow them to monetize the human population more effectively."

Nass noted that global actors such as the WHO "talk about sharing of specimens during a pandemic … so they can try to make vaccines too. However, they don't talk about performing surveillance on human beings. But what they do say, which let the cat out of the bag, is that they would want to get informed consent from countries for sharing of genomic data, rather than from individuals."

Part of this surveillance infrastructure also would include vaccine passports, which figure prominently in the pandemic treaty and amendments to the International Health Regulations (IHR) currently under negotiation at the WHO.

According to Littlejohn:

> "I believe that they laid the infrastructure during the COVID-19 crisis, and we're having a little bit of a 'break' here between pandemics, but that structure, that infrastructure is going to snap shut with the next pandemic if we don't stop it. That structure has to do with vaccine passports.
>
> "It could be called a 'smart health card' or 'digital health ID,' or even a mandatory digital driver's license can serve as the platform for a China-style social credit system. And there's a new bill in front of the Senate right now … the Improving Digital Identity Act of 2023 … It's a mandatory national ID that's going to be interoperable, coordinated, integrated and can serve as the same platform as China's social credit system … to surveil us."

Restrictions on human behavior could lower humans to the level of animals

The WHO's Oct. 3, 2022, document also claimed that "Some 60% of emerging infectious diseases that are reported globally come from animals, both wild and domestic," adding that "human activities and stressed ecosystems have created new opportunities for diseases to emerge and spread."

Such stressors "include animal trade, agriculture, livestock farming, urbanization, extractive industries, climate change, habitat fragmentation and encroachment into wild areas," according to the WHO.

"To the extent that carbon emissions due to transportation within cities would contribute to climate change, then the '15-minute city' would be a way of addressing that," Littlejohn said. "The danger is that they will enforce it by having surveillance cameras everywhere to make sure you don't go outside of your district without permission."

In a March 30 article, "Your Daughter for a Rat," Bell cited a One Health editorial published in The Lancet stating that "all life is equal, and of equal concern." In response, Bell suggested that One Health aims to lower humans to the level of animals.

The same Lancet article described One Health as "a call for ecological, not merely health, equity" and called for a "subtle but quite revolutionary shift of perspective" away from "anthropocentrism": "All life is equal, and of equal concern."

"It looks like this is going to be the justification for moving people down to the value of animals," Nass said in response; a sentiment shared by Boyle, who said, "One Health relates the healthcare of human beings to the healthcare of animals and thus reduces healthcare for human beings to the level of healthcare for animals."

According to Bell, "suggesting that we have a duty as a species on this planet to look after every species equally and treat them more equally [is] becoming sort of a religion or dogma. It defies what any rational society in the history of humanity" has practiced and is "a very unusual approach and potentially very scary."

One Health: Follow the money

The WHO has attempted to give theoretical credence to the One Health concept by developing a so-called "Theory of Change" (ToC).

Although the WHO says the ToC is designed to provide "a conceptual framework" for "organisations, agencies and initiatives working towards similar One Health goals" and a "common narrative of coherence," the theory itself does not appear to have a clear definition.

"They want to be able to do whatever they want," Littlejohn said. "If you define it, then you can hold them to the definition … one of the tactics is just to be really obscure and incomprehensible."

"This is a term that is used in these circles," Bell added. "It's stating the obvious, that if you do a certain act, you'll have a certain outcome. It's a fancy way of saying that."

Bell also referred to the "fallacy that is being pushed that humans are having increasing contact with wildlife," supposedly leading to "this threat of viruses jumping from wildlife to humans."

Calling it a "ludicrous claim," Bell said that "when humans move into wildlife habitats, the wildlife don't start living with humans. They die out."

Noting that "it used to be very common" for people to live with farm animals, Bell added that the claim that pandemics are becoming more common due to increased contact with animals is itself "not true," but is "used to instill fear and to try to get people to buy into this One Health, constant health emergency agenda."

Nass said One Health proponents "don't actually have any evidence" to support their claims, offering the example of antimicrobial resistance in bacteria found in meat consumed by humans, as a result of antibiotics administered to livestock. "That's been the hook that One Health has been hung on," Nass said.

However, Nass said this problem "could be solved in a heartbeat if the U.S. Food and Drug Administration or the U.S. Department of Agriculture just told farmers they can't put antibiotics into animal feed anymore, they can only use them when an animal gets sick."

In his recent article, Mercola suggested following the money. "Private interests wield immense power over the WHO, and a majority of the funding is 'specified,' meaning it's earmarked for particular programs. The WHO cannot allocate those funds wherever they're needed most."

As a result, this "massively influences what the WHO does and how it does it. So, the WHO is an organization that does whatever its funders tell it to do," naming organizations such as the Gates Foundation as prime funders of the WHO.

Bell said that supporters of One Health include "those who have been pushing the COVID agenda … and enriching themselves from it," including "private foundations who are on the bandwagon" and "corporations who stand to gain from controlling the food chain and controlling agriculture and pharmaceuticals, et cetera."

"It's corporate authoritarians that have benefited themselves from public health through COVID and the certainly inappropriate COVID response," Bell added. "And it's the same and it's not disconnected with the climate emergency agenda."

One prominent financial actor closely involved with the development of the One Health agenda is the World Bank, as WHO documents indicate.

At a November 2022 OHHLEP meeting, Franck Berthe, the World Bank's senior livestock specialist, introduced the World Bank's Financial Intermediary Fund, which would "allow countries to borrow funds to strengthen their health system and promote the OH [One Health] approach."

According to Nass, "the WHO and the World Bank have helped form this financing operation for the biosecurity agenda," while Boyle told The Defender, "There is nothing humanitarian about these backers and the WHO promoting the One Health agenda."

Both Nass and Bell said the One Health agenda is closely tied to the UN's Sustainable Development Goals and Agenda 2030. Bell said that the One Health agenda attempts to deal with a supposed "existential threat to human health" that "must be dealt with in a centralized way, rather than giving people a choice."

One Health closely tied to WHO pandemic treaty, IHR amendments

Experts who spoke with The Defender also emphasized the connections between the One Health concept and the pandemic treaty and IHR amendments under negotiation.

Mercola wrote that through the One Health agenda, which recognizes "a very broad range of aspects of life and the environment [that] can impact health and therefore fall under the 'potential' to cause harm," the WHO "will be able to declare climate change as a health emergency and subsequently require climate lockdowns."

Roguski, who has extensively researched the pandemic treaty and IHR amendments, said that in amendments the EU recently proposed for the pandemic treaty, the term "One Health" appears 29 times, including calling upon countries to develop and regularly update pandemic prevention plans via the One Health approach.

Referring to the need to prevent potential "pandemic situations," the proposals also call for strengthening global public health surveillance "using a One Health approach," which will also "address the drivers of the emergence and re-emergence of disease at the human-animal-environment interface, including but not limited to climate change, land use change, wildlife trade, desertification and antimicrobial resistance."

The proposals also suggest the One Health approach could be used "to produce science-based evidence, and support, facilitate and/or oversee the correct, evidence-based and risk-informed implementation of infection prevention and control," and go as far as to suggest targets on "antimicrobial consumption/use."

Roguski told The Defender that the latest draft of the pandemic treaty refers to One Health 13 times. Such language would "be used to take over complete control of our lives," Roguski added.

For example, one proposal states, "Each Party shall, in accordance with national law, adopt policies and strategies, supported by implementation plans, across the public and private sectors and relevant agencies, consistent with relevant tools, including, but not limited to, the International Health Regulations, and strengthen and reinforce public health functions for: (c) surveillance (including using a One Health approach)."

Other proposals include:

> "The Parties commit to strengthen multi-sectoral, coordinated, interoperable and integrated One Health surveillance systems … to identify and assess the risks and emergence of pathogens and variants with pandemic potential, in order to minimize spill-over events, mutations and the risks associated with zoonotic neglected tropical and vector-borne diseases, with a view to preventing small-scale outbreaks in wildlife or domesticated animals from becoming a pandemic.
>
> "Each Party shall … develop and implement a national One Health action plan on antimicrobial resistance that strengthens antimicrobial stewardship in the human and animal sectors, optimizes antimicrobial consumption, increases investment in, and promotes equitable and affordable access to, new medicines, diagnostic tools, vaccines and other interventions, strengthens infection prevention and control in health care settings and sanitation and biosecurity in livestock farms, and provides technical support to developing countries."

Roguski said the phrase "One Health" doesn't directly appear in documents related to the proposed IHR amendments, but he added the WHO "is going to try to get them both to prevail," referring to both the treaty and IHR amendments.

Littlejohn said, the One Health approach and the proposed language in the treaty "gives them the right to surveil and potentially control every aspect of life on earth."

Noting that the proposed treaty also calls for a "commitment to counteract 'misinformation,' 'disinformation,' and 'false news,'" Littlejohn added, "they're going to surveil our social media … and if any of us steps out of line by contradicting what the WHO says, then we could be censored."

"That's what I think is in mind with this commitment to 'coordinated, interoperable and integrated' One Health surveillance systems," Littlejohn added. "I think that's how it could end up being deployed. Ultimately, globalist entities, such as the World Economic Forum and the UN are using the WHO as their way of establishing global control."

"The reason that health is such a good pretext is that people can become terrified," Littlejohn added. "To the extent that their minds are paralyzed if they think they could die or get really sick, they're willing to give up freedoms that they would not be willing to give up in other contexts."

Roguski told The Defender:

> "They made a lot of bad decisions. They gave a lot of bad advice [and] they caused a lot of harm to a lot of people. You can't just give those people more power, authority and control without looking at what they did and going, 'no, you should not be in charge of any of this.'"

In turn, Mercola wrote that "The globalist takeover hinges on the successful creation of a feedback loop of surveillance for virus variants, declaration of potential risk followed by lockdowns and restrictions, followed by mass vaccinating populations to 'end' the pandemic restrictions, followed by more surveillance and so on."

And according to Bell, One Health "is part of a much bigger picture of finding ways to pull apart the intrinsic ideas that most societies have been built on."

"I think that this is part of a move to undo these sorts of ideas and to replace them with a sort of religion of fear of our surroundings and denigration of other humans that can then be used by very greedy people to increase their wealth and power," Bell said. "It's taken over public health to a large extent."

Subscribe to The Defender – It's Free!

First Name.. Last Name.. Email.. SIGN UP

SUGGEST A CORRECTION



Michael Nevradakis, Ph.D.

Michael Nevradakis, Ph.D., based in Athens, Greece, is a senior reporter for The Defender and part of the rotation of hosts for CHD.TV's "Good Morning CHD."

Sign up for free news and updates from Children's Health Defense. CHD focuses on legal strategies to defend the health of our children and obtain justice for those injured. We can't do it without your support

Republishing Guidelines

Children's Health Defense Comment Policy

We welcome relevant and respectful comments. Off-topic comments may be removed.

Please read our Comment Policy before commenting.

Got it

29 Comments

1 Login ▾

Join the discussion…

LOG IN WITH

OR SIGN UP WITH DISQUS ?

Name

♡ 8 • Share

Best Newest Oldest

Polly Green
3 days ago edited

This is the second step in establishing a universal response to every single aspect of human "health" care—not Medical care—but the more vaguely defined "healthcare." And why? It's because algorithms work SO WELL, right?
"Sir, this coat comes in two sizes. One is too large and the other is too small. Which would you like?"
I once got in an argument with a surgeon who claimed "all benzodiazepines are the same." In fact, I had been fully conscious during a total knee replacement because of this mistaken assumption. I said, if they are identical why doesn't the FDA scrap their approval of all but one? The WHO is actually seeking to eliminate those who do not fit into a neat system. This will make us better components of their coming BORG. Resistance will be futile in the dystopian future they have in their sick imaginations.

14 0 Reply • Share ›

Ricky Ricardo → Polly Green
3 days ago

...and people are all the same - right? This one-size-fits-all mentality is ludicrous, at best! I decided to become my own doctor; because I'm the **only** one who really knows **my** body! I've had three incidents of skin cancer (Squamous cell carcinoma) and each time I went to the clinic to see the doctors, I told them that it was a carcinoma. The doctors didn't know until they got the biopsy back! One of them told me that he "thought" it was a wart. I demanded a biopsy. The biopsy only confirmed what I already knew. What good are they? They should pay **me** for doing their diagnosis for them!

5 0 Reply • Share ›

Polly Green → Ricky Ricardo
3 days ago

Ha! I had the same thing happen to me! "Uh, I really didn't think it was cancer. It didn't look malignant, not really." Honestly, clinical expertise is a lost art amongst physicians these days. They've already come to fear touching patients or checking with their own eyes and hope instead to rely on lab reports and imaging, but that's a fool's game. I never trust an MD relies on such things.

8 0 Reply • Share ›

Someone
3 days ago

Even if it wasn't about control something called "One Health" doesn't sound good to me. Anything one size fits all in something that varies so much from person to person is terrible.

WHO needs to get out of our personal lives and focus on what they were created for: to ensure the poor have access to health care.

12 0 Reply • Share ›

BraveNewWhirled → Someone
3 days ago

If the WHO is established to provide access to genuine health care for the poor, they certainly have not done a good job of it and we are silly to trust them with anything more than giving out band-aids.

7 0 Reply • Share ›

Karen Bracken

Donate Now

You make the difference.

Latest News



'Absolutely Reckless': NIH Allows EcoHealth Alliance to Resume Coronavirus Research



'Just Like Regular Pork': FDA Grants 'Investigational' Approval for Pork Products Made From Gene-Edited Pigs



More Pesticides on Kids' Food? EPA Wants to Greenlight Chemical Linked to Reproduction, Developmental Issues

MORE NEWS

Latest Views

Chemical in Popular Bug Spray Brands May Cause Neurodevelopmental Damage



Top 20 'Nonprofit' Hospitals Pocketed $23 Billion in Taxpayer-Funded COVID Aid



Can We Reboot the Environmental Movement — So It Protects Freedom, Too?

MORE VIEWS

Get FREE News & Updates!

First Name..

Last Name..

Email..

SIGN UP

Get Text Alerts

Sign up for breaking news from The Defender.

Currently only eligible for numbers in the U.S. and Canada.

1234567890

Phone

REQUIRED. Phone number must be in a standard 10-digit format: 1234567890 or 123-456-7890

CONTINUE

3 days ago

The WHO will become (or already has become) the military arm of the UN.

11 0 Reply • Share ›

Ricky Ricardo → Karen Bracken
3 days ago

I thought that the UN was the military arm of the WHO. Is it not the UN that has thousands of troops?

4 0 Reply • Share ›

GarySummers → Karen Bracken
2 days ago

Breaking* Plus Our Insane US Govt, NIH.
"NIH restarts Bat Virus grant suspended 3 years ago by Trump"
"Three years after then-President Donald Trump pressured the National Institutes of Health (NIH) to suspend a research grant to a U.S. group studying bat coronaviruses with partners in China, the agency has restarted the award."
https://www.science.org/con...

3 0 Reply • Share ›

Ricky Ricardo
3 days ago

Let's call this what it is: The Great Reset - AKA; The New World Order! New name...same agenda! The oligarchs want total control - of everything on the planet; including humanity! The thing is...they want to **change** humanity. I think that process has already begun.

9 0 Reply • Share ›

Polly Green → Ricky Ricardo
3 days ago edited

Here's an interesting article/video from James Corbett of the Corbett Report on the transhumanism agenda (using published documentation). Yuval Herari is one scary, creepy guy and he's just the tip of the spear. https://www.corbettreport.c...

5 0 Reply • Share ›

Ricky Ricardo → Polly Green
2 days ago

Thanks for the link, Polly. I don't think I have that one in my collection. I'll have to watch it tomorrow. I already know that it will be worth it. I enjoy listening to James. He definitely understands that "nothing is as it seems" in this existence. Most of what the masses believe to be true; is a lie! The oligarchs treat us all like mushrooms...Keep us in the dark and feed us $hit! For the record: Yuval Noah Harari stated in one of his videos that there "is no God, up there". He believes that "they" will become gods - through technology! Revelation says that the masses will worship the "Beast" and that they will all receive a mark, so that they can't buy or sell, unless they have the "mark". It also states that this text requires wisdom to understand all of this. I'm certain that the "new God" will have something to do with A.I.. I won't have any part of it!

1 0 Reply • Share ›

Polly Green → Ricky Ricardo
a day ago

Nor will I. What I find interesting is how much they fear Catholics like myself. It has to be because our beliefs are contrary to to the Regime's values. Maybe they fear us because we realize that fire might have to rain down from the sky to get rid of these loathsome creeps, and we pray for it daily. Do they think our prayers might be answered??
The late comedian Norm Macdonald famously pointed out that when atheists argue against the existence of a supreme being they don't go after Scientology, or Buddhism or Hindus. Nah, they argue against the Christian god, which signals a deep down belief in that particular being.
Is this what causes FBI agents to infiltrate churches on behalf of the military industrial complex?

2 0 Reply • Share ›

Ricky Ricardo → Polly Green
19 hours ago

Covid "lockdown": Liquor stores open - churches closed...any questions!

0 0 Reply • Share ›

Nichole → Ricky Ricardo
an hour ago

I think it is much much worse because they want to poison the good foods that we eat that sustain us and heal us and they use frequencies to do the same. The various holistic and natural products that have been found to remove some of what they have been adding to our bodies through various means are also actively being attacked in terms of making laws to over regulate them or to outright ban their use and if that does not work they will make every attempt to make these things unavailable. They long ago brought over Nazi scientists who created chemicals that they began finding ways of putting it in our food supply but when that was discovered they moved onto other chemical pesticides that also have been found to be deadly. Why is it when people like Bill Gates and Elon Musk and others discuss solutions to our problems they are always coming up with eugenist solutions that kill us? Their solutions are always chemical and technical and never natural and simple.

0 0 Reply • Share ›

Ektor57
3 days ago

It's really ONE DEATH...for each of us as the parasites at the WHO hate all humans.

6 0 Reply • Share ›

BraveNewWhirled
3 days ago

It's more than just their thirst for yet more money and power which drives the tyrants. This is a spiritual battle, fought on a physical battlefield, and they know it. This is why they misdirect us, and teach our children that our Creator is not real; that we all came from a puddle of goo. They are very afraid of us. Let us all recognize we are more powerful than them. Let us recognize our Humanity and assert the power we have through our Creator. Let us turn our face to him and commit to him everything we do; and our actions will be justly guided.

4 0 Reply • Share ›

Long Ben
2 days ago

This Crap is Contrary to the Liberty interest of every last human of good will the Whole World over. Nuff said.

3 0 Reply • Share ›

Martina Vaslovik
2 days ago

Well then, the globalist tyrants certainly are playing for ALL the marbles.

3 0 Reply • Share ›

informed dissent
2 days ago

Their moves are always towards more centralization ("One"), which means that decentralization and diffuse power is what benefits humanity.....not the control freaks on top.

3 0 Reply • Share ›

p. gutierrez
2 days ago

I am concur with David Bell, Nass and Boyle's observations below regarding One Health.

"Bell suggested that One Health aims to lower humans to the level of animals. ......According to Bell, "suggesting that we have a duty as a species on this planet to look after every species equally and treat them more equally [is] becoming sort of a religion or dogma. It defies what any rational society in the history of humanity" has practiced and is "a very unusual approach and potentially very scary."

God gave man dominion over the animal kingdom in the book of Genesis in the Bible. 'Bad religion' is when men worshiped the creature/animal, rather than God. Some ancient religions worshipped bulls, some worshipped fish, etc. I call this, 'bad One Health', putting animals on yhe same plane as men, or on a plane above men. Reason is the falculty in man, that differentiates man as a species from animals. As well as man having a soul that God imparted into him on the day of creation, that God feels may be worth saving. Animals purportedly do not have souls.

Surely there may be creatures somewhere in the universe, that are part animal and part man, such as lizard men. But Earthlings will deal with those 'hybrid creatures'

see more

3 0 Reply • Share ›

p. gutierrez → p. gutierrez
a day ago

One Health not necessarily surveil everything on the earth. That is the VIROME project for viruses, and the human genome project. In the picture below, you can see the connectedness of animal health and
human health, according to the One Health approach.

see more

0 0 Reply • Share ›

orangputeh
2 days ago

Singapore's health minister doesn't have a clue about the deaths and permanent damage done by the COVID "vaccines". He is their misinformation leader. How sad.
....
S'pore's Covid-19 infection wave waning, but vaccinations still crucial: said Health Minister Ong Ye Kung Straits Times Singapore
SINGAPORE – The first Covid-19 infection wave that Singapore has experienced since transitioning to Dorscon green is waning, although the more than 300 Covid-19 patients currently hospitalised have added significant workload to the hospitals, said Health Minister Ong Ye Kung in Parliament on Tuesday.
He said the wave peaked about two weeks ago at an estimated 4,000 infections per day. It has since subsided to about 3,000 infections a day.
He added that Singapore has weathered the wave without imposing any further public health measures, and that **this public health posture is only possible if Singapore residents continue to take their Covid-19 vaccinations**...
But **the country's population resilience has strengthened due to vaccinations, boosters** to keep them updated and recovery from infections, which enabled the nation to treat it as an endemic disease, said Mr Ong...

https://str.sg/iors

3 0 Reply • Share ›

Cindy
3 days ago

So, how do we stop this...

3 0 Reply • Share ›

Guido Vandeven → Cindy
3 days ago

Easy it will fall flat and prove itself as a failure. One health how many viruses, pandemics, threats will escape (leak) or even created by this control you think, a dozen? Hundreds?....over which no more control is possible. Trust in nature, it has a course of its own but not always as we want it to follow, so live unprepared as we always did.

3 0 Reply • Share ›

gnt
2 days ago

"One" Health sounds oddly reminiscent of what the browncoats in Germany in the 1930s and 40s used to say... Ein Reich, Ein Volk, Ein Fuhrer... except now it is the UN and WHO taking on that role. Not surprising considering the UN's first secretary general was a Nazi and the WHO is led by a terrorist.

2 0 Reply • Share ›

jwm79
2 days ago

Great piece. Ever notice almost no one is talking about One Health, even in the alternative media? This is a positively evil agenda.

1 0 Reply • Share ›

Miles
2 days ago

The solution to the Centralised One World Government with total loss of freedom is decentralised community groups, large and diverse enough to meet the needs (not wants) of all community members.
By this approach we can all obtain our basic needs for food, accommodation, security, transportation, employment, socialisation, leadership and self actualisation.

1 0 Reply • Share ›

Paul Hastilow
2 days ago

The Pushing of the "One Health" Agenda is obviously Intentionally Miss Leading.
You have the "Triage" of People, Animals, Plants.
3 very Diverse Entities, with Innumerable differences, outside of Food, Water, Air.
To somehow lump them All together is Ludicrous.?
As with Doctors and other Professions, we All have to Learn and Understand the Basics of our Elected Profession.
Only when we have Mastered the Basics do we then "Specialize"
We are being Propagandised and Brainwashed into believing their Narrative.
Well sorry, 'cus it ain't gonna work...?
One Health is Not obtainable and is Delusional to think it is.
There is Nothing Wrong with the System as it is.
We have "Experts" on People, Animals, Plants.
We Do Not Need WHO, WEF, Gates Foundation CDC, FDA, CIA, FBI, NIH etc
To Guide us via Manipulation.
Please go back to the Hole you crawled out of and Think again.
Only God can decide our future.....and you Thought Police ain't welcome.

1 0 Reply • Share ›

Nichole
2 hours ago edited

For me, I think the goal must be not to plead with WHO to please give us our rights because our own government signed onto the first Agenda 21 that then led to those first IHR agreements that are now just being amended most likely in the same way that Common Rule, the Public Health Service Act, PREP act, and countless executive orders are also amended in this way by committee and a team of lawyers rather than by public approval, yet they are called laws and treated as legally binding except when they are caught lying that is. These things are done behind closed doors by powerful people who we should all not forget are many of them secretly eugenists. The things that are being done right now to all of us are much more dangerous and sinister than oh well I got this vaccine and it is going to cause me to have an autoimmune disorder or cancer at some point. What is going on and has been for decades is the manipulation of our genes and the various injections, additives in our foods and nanoparticles sprayed in the air are now all coming together inside our bodies so that they can manipulate us/gene edit us/get rid of us by way of electromagnetic frequencies because they can control our bodies and minds with frequency manipulation without these things, it is just much easier with them.

I simply do not understand how we all are not demanding an end immediate to this, we still are just begging our leaders to please use their authorities to help please, please, please

see more

0 0 Reply • Share ›

Subscribe Privacy Do Not Sell My Data

Children's Health Defense®

Children's Health Defense® is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization. Our mission is to end childhood health epidemics by working aggressively to eliminate harmful exposures, hold those responsible accountable and establish safeguards to prevent future harm. We fight corruption, mass surveillance and censorship that put profits before people as well as advocate for worldwide rights to health freedom and bodily autonomy.

EN ES FR

SUBSCRIBE - IT'S FREE! BECOME A MEMBER MEMBER LOGIN

Donations are tax deductible to the full extent of the law. EIN #26-0388604

Children's Health Defense • Legal Disclaimer • Terms of Use • Privacy Policy • Donate • Work for CHD • Whistleblowers Welcome • Contact • Social • Sitemap

© 2016 - 2023 Children's Health Defense® • All Rights Reserved